

REMARKS

Claims 27, 34 and 40 have been amended.

The Examiner has rejected applicant's claims 27, 28, 34, 35, 40 and 41 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by the Girerd et al. (U.S. 6,131,067) patent. With respect to applicant's claims, as amended, the Examiner's rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claims 27, 34 and 40 have been amended to more clearly define the invention. More particularly, independent claim 27 now recites a connection apparatus for connecting with a remote site, comprising moving means for moving a part, input means for inputting an output from a device used for detecting information for positioning the part moved by said moving means, and transmission means for transmitting to the remote site data in accordance with the output, wherein the data is used as identification in connection with the remote site. Independent claims 34 and 40 have been similarly amended.

Such constructions are not taught or suggested by the cited art of record. The Examiner has argued as follows:

"Applicant argues that Girerd et al fails to disclose moving a part and a device used for detecting information for positioning the part to be moved.

Regarding Applicant's argument that Girerd et al. fails to disclose moving a part, the cell is a movable part, which transmits a GPS signal to determine the location of the cell (i. e. positioning the cell phone).

Regarding Applicant's argument that Girerd et al fails to disclose a device used for detecting information for positioning the part to be moved, this limitation is not recited in the rejected claim(s). . . . Furthermore, the Final Rejection dated 03/07/2005 contains rejections of positioning parts to be moved."

Applicant notes first that applicant's claims recite "moving means" for moving a part or the "step of moving" a part and not merely a part that is capable of being moved, like a cell phone. Moreover, the claims further require inputting an output from a device used for

detecting information for positioning the part moved by the moving means. There is clearly nothing taught in the Girerd, et al. patent of inputting an output from a device used for detecting information for positioning the part moved by a moving means. Thus, nothing is disclosed in the Girerd, et al. patent of detecting information for positioning the cell phone, so there can be no input means for inputting information for such positioning. This is made clear from the passages of the Girerd, et al. patent cited by the Examiner, i. e., column 2, lines 36-53, column 4, lines 23-64 and column 6, lines 23-48, all of which are devoid of any such teaching.

Moreover, the Examiner cannot dismiss this feature simply by arguing that the claims do not recite a device used for detecting information for positioning a part. The fact is that the Girerd, et al. patent does not teach an input means for inputting the out put of such a device. Finally, the rejections for positioning parts to be moved in the 03/07/2005 final rejection would appear to have no applicability to the Girerd, et al. patent and were successfully distinguished in applicant's response filed on June 10, 2005. Applicant's independent claims 27, 34 and 40, and their respective dependent claims, thus patentably distinguish over the Girerd, et al. patent.

In view of the above, it is submitted that applicant's claims, as amended, patentably distinguish over the cited art of record. Accordingly, reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.


Applicant notes also that applicant has filed concurrently herewith A Request For Telephone Interview requesting the Examiner to permit applicant's undersigned attorney to interview this application to discuss the subject Amendment and any unresolved patentability

issues.

Dated: January 25, 2006

COWAN, LIEBOWITZ & LATMAN, P. C.
1133 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036
T (212) 790-9200

Respectfully submitted,


John J. Torrente
Reg. No. 26359
Attorney of Record